



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & ECONOMIC GROWTH
LANSING

KEITH W. COOLEY
DIRECTOR

Analysis of Enrolled Senate Bill 750

Topic: Veterans' Employment Preference

Sponsor: Senator Basham

Co-Sponsors: Senators Allen, Garcia, Pappageorge, Richardville, Birkholz, Kahn, Jelinek, Van Woerkom, Patterson, Cropsey, Hardiman, Gilbert, Cassis, McManus, Kuipers, Olshove, Jansen, Switalski, Stamas, Jacobs, Brown, Cherry, Barcia, Gleason, Whitmer, Sanborn, Bishop, Anderson, Schauer, Hunter, Scott, Clark-Coleman, and Clarke

Committee: Senate Senior Citizens and Veterans Affairs
House Military & Veterans' Affairs & Homeland Security

Date Introduced: September 6, 2007

Date Enrolled: February 26, 2008 (tentative)

Date of Analysis: February 20, 2008

Position: The Department of Labor & Economic Growth supports the bill.

Problem/Background: Veterans' employment preference has existed in one form or another since the Revolutionary War. Early forms of preference were typically based on European models and featured pensions, service bonuses, disability allowances, and hospitalization for service injuries. Congress passed the first veterans' appointment preference law in 1865 for Union veterans separated for wounds or illnesses. Although the law was amended in the Nineteenth Century, the first major expansion of veterans' preference benefits occurred in 1919 in the Census Act, which granted preference to all honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of injured veterans. For the first time, preference was not based on a service-connected disability. Today, veterans' preference derives from the Veterans Preference Act of 1944. This law has been amended many times and provides the framework for veterans' preference in federal employment. Many states, including Michigan, have enacted similar laws to assist veterans in their transition to civilian jobs.

Description of Bill: The bill amends Public Act 205 of 1897 to delete the requirement that an applicant for a public sector job be a resident of the county in which the office or position is located for at least one year. The applicant would still be required to be of good moral character, to have resided in the state for at least two years, and possess other requisite qualifications.

Summary of Arguments

Pro: The requirement in this law that a person be a resident of the county in which the office or position may have made sense in the Nineteenth Century, but it is not relevant to the mobile society of the Twenty-first Century.

Con: The language in this statute is archaic. Its application to many types of public employment is unclear.

Fiscal/Economic Impact

(a) Department: The bill will have no fiscal impact on the department.

(b) State: The bill will have no fiscal impact on the state.

(c) Local Government

Comments: Many of the positions affected by the proposed change in employment preference would be local positions.

Other State Departments: The Department of Military and Veterans Affairs is interested in the bill.

Any Other Pertinent Information: None.

Administrative Rules Impact: There is no administrative rulemaking authority in the bill.